: -
_

Independent Review conducted by:		Steve Roberts	on				
Area(s) of Expert	ise: H	lair and Fibe					
		1:30 PM	(Time),	03/14/2001	(Date	e)	
File #: 7-1799	3					-	
Laboratory #(s):	11006	6048			30204	076	
11021084		084			30211	003	
	20820	037					
			Examiner(	s) & Symbols	3		
	F	Reviewed	Not Reviewed			Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ		Χo					۵
		В	0			0	
		0	0			0	o
Trial testimony tra	onscript(	s) of:	Material	s Reviewed			
Testimon		_		Pages:			
aboratory Report(	s):						
Laboratory Number: 11		er: 1100	06048/11021084		Date:	Oct 30, 1981	I
			20037		Date:	Aug 20, 198	2
Laboratory Number: 302		er: 3020	04076/30211003		Date:	March 14, 1	983
Examiner Bench !	Notes of:	RQ			_		
Laboratory Number:		ber: 1100	06048/11021084		_		
		2082	20037		_		
		3020	4076/30211003		_		
			Page 1	of3	-		
			. Initials:	Sur			
						CRM	. 3716

Was any other material reviewed? X□ Yes	□ No						
If yes, please identify and/or describe the material:  2-7-83)	ubmitting agency letters (dated 9-30-81, 1-31-83 and						
Results of Review							
File #: 7-17993 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1, K125, K20, Q201, Q92, Q263,							
K159, K160, K129							
Review of Laboratory Re	port(s) and Bench Notes:						
Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses							
Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?  \[ \$\text{\$\tex							
Review of Testimony:							
Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses							
X□ Transcript not available.							
3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)?	□ Yes □ No □ Unable to Determine						
4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes?	□ Yes □ No □ Unable to Determine						
5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise?	□ Yes □ No □ Unable to Determine						
Page 2 of 3							
Initials: Suc							

Comments
(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 7-17993			
#1: With microscopic hai	r comparison, even with the	ne best notes, there is no wa	ay to determine the comparison
was performed correctly.			
#2: The examination resu	lts set forth in the laborato	ry report are supported by	the bench notes, but the
documentation is margina	ally adequate. The notes ar	e not dated or initialed and	are in pencil. RQ uses
abbreviations to indicate t	the microscopic characteris	stics of the hair. These abbr	reviations are difficult to interpret.
	_		
	•		
Review completed at:	2:15 PM (Time),	03/14/2001	_ (Date)
Total time spent conduction	ng review (to nearest 1/4 h	our): 0:45 hours	
I hereby certify that I condu are fully documented on thi			and that the results of my review
		Shew Kobuts	03/14/2001
	/	(Signature)	(Date)

3 of 3
Initials: Sur Page